



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,205	11/03/2003	Curtis Reese	200311942-1	4185
22879 7590 06/22/2007 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER WILLS, LAWRENCE E	
			ART UNIT 2609	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/22/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/700,205

Applicant(s)

REESE ET AL.

Examiner

Lawrence E. Wills

Art Unit

2609

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/3/2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is the initial Office Action based on the application filed on July 18, 2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 1-3, 6, 13-15, 18, 25-27, and 30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Tanimoto (US Patent No. 6,952,280)**.

With regard to claim 1, 13, and 25, Tanimoto teaches a printer access control module 3 within a printer 2 that is operable to receive a request from a client computer for printing resource authorization, determine the policy domain of the requesting client computer, and grant printing resource authorization based on the determined policy domain. (Column 3, lines 18-32)

With regard to claim 2, 14, and 26, Tanimoto teaches a printer access control module 3 wherein granting printing resource authorization comprises granting full printing resource authorization to client computers that are members of the policy

domain and granting limited printing resource authorization to client computers that are not members of the policy domain. (Figure 4 and column 4, lines 32-50)

With regard to claim 3, 15, and 27, Tanimoto teaches a printer access control module 3 wherein granting printing resource authorization comprises granting greater printing resource authorization to client computers that are members of the policy domain than to client computers that are not members of the policy domain (Figure 4 and column 4, lines 32-50)

With regard to claim 6, 18, and 30, Tanimoto teaches a printer access control module 3, wherein the printing resource comprises specific print media, specific print media comprising at least one of letterhead, check stock, glossy paper, and transparencies. (Column 3, lines 61-67)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 4, 16, and 28** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tanimoto (US Patent No. 6,952,280)** in view of **Berndt et al (US Patent Publication No. 2003/0151760)**.

With regard to claim 4, 16, and 28, Tanimoto teaches a printer access control module 3.

Tanimoto does not teach the printing resource comprising color printing.

Berndt teaches a printing resource comprising color printing. (paragraph 0004)

At the time when the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the printer access control module to limit the use of such resources as color printing on a network.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to make the network printer more economical and printing less expensive. (See paragraph 0004)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Berndt with Tanimoto to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4, 16, 28.

6. **Claims 5, 7, 17, 19, 29, and 31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tanimoto (US Patent No. 6,952,280)** in view of **Bhogal et al (US Patent No. 6,985,244)**.

With regard to claim 5, 17, and 29, Tanimoto teaches a printer access control module 3.

Tanimoto does not teach the printing resource that includes high-volume printing comprising print jobs over a specified page limit.

Bhogal teaches the printing resource comprising high-volume printing with print jobs over a specified page limit (Column 1, lines 33-39)

At the time when the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a printer access control module to limit the use of high-volume printing on a network.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to make the network printer more economical (i.e. printing jobs less expensive).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bhogal with Tanimoto to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5, 17, and 29.

With regard to claim 7, 19, and 31, Tanimoto teaches a printer access control module 3.

Tanimoto does not teach the printing resource comprises at least one of a maximum cost per page, maximum cost per period of time, and maximum pages per period of time.

Bhogal teaches the printing resource comprising maximum pages per period of time. (Column 1, lines 33-39)

At the time when the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to limit the amount of pages used by one user on a network printer.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to make the printing resource less expensive.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bhogal with Tanimoto to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7, 19, 31.

7. **Claims 8, 9, 20, 21, 32, and 33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tanimoto (US Patent No. 6,952,280)** in view of **Kuroyanagi (US Patent No. 6,545,767)**.

With regard to claim 8, 20, and 32, Tanimoto teaches a printer access control module 3, wherein

Tanimoto does not teach the policy domain comprising a predefined portion of network node addresses on a local area network.

Kuroyanagi teaches the policy domain comprising a predefined portion of network node addresses on a local area network. (Figure 5, in addition, Column 3, lines 38-48)

At the time when the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine and grant authorization to a policy domain that includes defined addresses on the network.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to increase the reliability and accuracy of the printer access control module.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kuroyanagi with Tanimoto to obtain the invention as specified in claims 8, 20 and 32.

With regard to claim 9, 21, and 33, Tanimoto teaches a printer access control module 3. wherein the policy domain comprises a predefined group of identifiable users.

Tanimoto does not teach a policy domain comprising a predefined group of identifiable users.

Kuroyanagi teaches the policy domain comprising a predefined group of identifiable users. (Figure 5, in addition, Column 3, lines 38-48)

At the time when the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine and grant authorization to a policy domain that includes defined group of users on the network.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to increase the reliability and accuracy of the printer access control module.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kuroyanagi with Tanimoto to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9, 21 and 33.

8. **Claims 10-12, 22-24, and 34-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tanimoto (US Patent No. 6,952,280)** in view of **Wiegley (US Patent No. 6,711,677)**.

With regard to claim 10, 22, and 34, Tanimoto teaches a printer access control module 3.

Tanimoto does not teach a policy domain comprising network nodes possessing a printer security key.

Wiegley teaches a policy domain comprising network nodes possessing a printer security key. (Column 4, lines 30-66)

At the time when the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine and grant authorization based on nodes who possess a printer security key.

The suggestion/motiyation for doing so would have been to increase the reliability and accuracy of the printer access control module.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wiegley with Tanimoto to obtain the invention as specified in claims 10, 22, and 34.

With regard to claim 11, 23, and 35, Tanimoto teaches a printer access control module 3.

Tanimoto does not teach granting printing resource authorization based on the determined policy domain comprises issuing the client computer a printer security key that identifies the client computer to the printer.

Wiegley teaches granting printing resource authorization based on the determined policy domain comprises issuing the client computer a printer security key that identifies the client computer to the printer (Column 4, lines 30-66).

At the time when the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine and grant authorization based on an issued security key that the printer can identify.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to increase the reliability and accuracy of the printer access control module.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wiegley with Tanimoto to obtain the invention as specified in claims 11, 23, and 35.

With regard to claim 12, 24, and 36, Tanimoto teaches a printer access control module 3.

Tanimoto does not teach a security key being used with each print job to identify the client's granted printer resource authorization to the printer.

Wiegley teaches a security key being used with each print job to identify the client's granted printer resource authorization to the printer. (Column 4, lines 4-66)

At the time when the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine and grant authorization based on an issued security key that the printer can identify for each print job.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to increase the reliability and accuracy of the printer access control module.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wiegley with Tanimoto to obtain the invention as specified in claims 12, 24, and 36.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Davis et al. (US Patent No. 5,633,932), Anderson et al. (US Patent No. 6,144,959) and Mazzagatte et al. (US Patent No. 6,862,583).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence E. Wills whose telephone number is 571-270-3145. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Eisen can be reached on 571-272-7687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2609

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LEW

June 14, 2007



ALEXANDER EISEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600